

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-23 are currently pending in the application, as amended. Claims 1 and 18-20 have been amended and new claims 21-23 have been added. Support for the amendment to the claims can be found in at least paragraphs [0027]-[0030], Figs. 7-8b and throughout the specification as-filed. The Abstract has been amended to correct formalities. No new matter has been added.

All amendments presented herein are made solely to expedite prosecution of the application without admission as to the propriety of the rejections set forth in the present Office Action and without acquiescence to the Examiner's characterization of the claims or cited references. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to include claims of the same or different scope as previously written in one or more continuing applications.

This Amendment is being simultaneously filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114.

Specification

2. The Examiner has provided a reminder for the proper language and format of the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended accordingly.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 15, 16, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,151,749 to Long ("Long"). Independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended without admission as to the propriety of the rejection and without acquiescence to the Examiner's characterization of the claims or cited reference. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as it may apply to the amended claims as follows.

Applicant respectfully submits that Long does not disclose or suggest each and every element of amended independent claims 1 and 20. For example, Long does not disclose or suggest a drive unit configured to directly drive the drive axle of the dosing means and directly drive the axle of the agitator when the dosing module is connected with the housing as claimed.

Application No. 10/589,062
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2010

For at least that reason, Long fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1 and 20 of the present application.

Claim 15, 16 and 19 depend on claim 1 and are patentable over Long for at least the same reason discussed above. Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw any rejection of claims 1, 15, 16, 19 and 20 based upon anticipation by Long.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. The Examiner indicated that claims 17 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 17 and 18 include allowable subject matter.

Claims 17 and 18 have been rewritten into independent form as new claims 21 and 22. Additionally, new claim 23 is allowable over Long for at least the same reason discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant points out that the present Amendment places the application into allowable form.

Application No. 10/589,062
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2010

CONCLUSION

5. In view of the foregoing Amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application, including claims 1-23, as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner determine otherwise, Applicant's representatives suggest a telephone interview in order to expedite prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 13, 2010

By: /John L. Hemmer/
JOHN L. HEMMER
Registration No. 58,752
KENNETH J. DAVIS
Registration No. 50,688
Attorneys for Applicant

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921
Telephone: (215) 963-5000
Direct Dial: (215) 963-4816
Facsimile: (215) 963-5001
Customer No. 28977